

## **Remarks**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 11, 14-16, 19, 21, 24-27, and 30 have been amended. Claims 2, 10, 12, 20, 22, and 23 have been cancelled. No claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1, 3-9, 11, 13-19, 21, and 24-30 are presented for examination.

## **35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection**

Claims 1-15 and 20-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Masenas (U.S. Patent No. 5,771,010). Applicants submit that the present claims are patentable over Masenas.

Masenas discloses an apparatus for compressing data in accordance with a Lempel-Ziv type algorithm. A Lempel-Ziv (L-Z) algorithm compression engine is designed to receive a stream of data bytes, store the bytes in a history memory, and compare each new byte to the stored bytes in order to detect repeated patterns of bytes so that the pattern of repetition can be used as a basis for reducing the amount of data that needs to be transmitted. If new data to be processed includes a string or sequence of two or more data bytes that have been processed before, then a token comprising a value length and a relative address of the previously processed data string will be generated. Since the new data, which includes such string of previously processed data bytes can be expressed using fewer bits of information than that contained in the data string itself, the data stream is effectively compressed. If the new data to be processed does not form part of a previous data string existing in memory, there can be no compression and the raw data must be transmitted as a raw token. See Masenas at col. 1, lines 25-42.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method for compressing an electronic mail message comprising:

identifying a block of data within said electronic mail message which is found in a previous electronic mail message;

generating a pointer identifying said block of data in said previous electronic mail message;

replacing said block of data in said electronic mail message with said pointer; and

transmitting said electronic mail message to a wireless data processing device, said wireless data processing device having said previous electronic mail message stored thereon.

Applicants submit that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Masenas of transmitting an electronic mail message to a wireless data processing device having the previous electronic mail message stored thereon. The Examiner asserts, “Masenas transmits data to a device for storage.” Final Office Action at page 2, paragraph 3. Applicants can find nowhere in Masenas transmitting a compressed electronic mail message to a wireless data processing device. Additionally, Applicants claim the wireless data processing device as having a previous electronic mail message stored on it. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Masenas.

Claims 3-9 depend from claim 1 and include additional limitations. Therefore, claims 3-9 are also patentable over Masenas.

Claim 11, as amended, recites:

A system comprising:

message identification logic for identifying a previous electronic mail message which contains a block of data found in a new electronic mail message;

state-based compression logic for compressing said new electronic mail message by replacing said block of data with a pointer identifying said block of data in said previous electronic mail message; and

transmission logic for transmitting said new electronic mail message to a wireless data processing device, said

wireless data processing device having said previous  
electronic mail message stored thereon.

Similar to the discussion above, Masenas does not disclose or suggest transmission logic for transmitting a new electronic mail message to a wireless data processing device having a previous electronic mail message stored on it. As a result, claim 11 is patentable over Masenas for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. As claims 13-19 depend from claim 11 and include additional limitations, claims 13-19 are also patentable over Masenas.

Claim 21, as amended, recites:

A method comprising:  
providing an interface to a message service, said  
interface compressing messages and forwarding said  
compressed messages to a wireless data processing device,  
wherein said interface compresses an electronic mail  
message by searching for prior electronic mail messages  
transmitted to or received from said wireless data  
processing device which include a block of data found in  
said electronic mail message and replacing said block of  
data with a pointer to said block of data in said prior  
electronic mail messages; and  
transmitting said electronic mail message to a wireless  
data processing device, said wireless data processing device  
having said previous electronic mail message stored.

Similar to the discussion above, Masenas does not disclose or suggest transmitting an electronic mail message to a wireless data processing device having a previous electronic mail message stored on it. As a result, claim 21 is patentable over Masenas for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. As claims 24-30 depend from claim 21 and include additional limitations, claims 24-30 are also patentable over Masenas.

### **35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection**

Claims 16-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Masenas in view of Ishida et al. (EP 909,037). Applicants submit that the present claims are patentable over Masenas even in view of Ishida.

Ishida discloses a method by which a test pattern supplied to an integrated circuit for testing can be efficiently compressed. See Ishida at Abstract. Nevertheless, Ishida does not disclose or suggest transmitting an electronic mail message to a wireless data processing device having the previous electronic mail message stored thereon. As described above with respect to claim 1, Masenas does not disclose or suggest such a limitation. Therefore, any combination of Masenas and Ishida would also not disclose or suggest the above stated limitation. Consequently, the present claims are patentable over Masenas in view of Ishida.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome, and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: August 14, 2003

  
Mark L. Watson  
Reg. No. 46,322

---

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(303) 740-1980